arXiv:1510.01341v1 [math.AT] 5 Oct 2015

SHRINKABILITY, RELATIVE LEFT PROPERNESS, AND DERIVED BASE CHANGE

PHILIP HACKNEY, MARCY ROBERTSON, AND DONALD YAU

ABSTRACT. For a connected pasting scheme $\mathcal{G}$, under reasonable assumptions on the underlying category, the category of $\mathfrak{C}$-colored $\mathcal{G}$-props admits a cofibrantly generated model category structure. In this paper, we show that, if $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under shrinking internal edges, then this model structure on $\mathcal{G}$-props satisfies a weaker version of left properness for weak equivalences between equivariantly-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props. Connected pasting schemes satisfying this closure property include those for all connected wheeled graphs (for wheeled properads), wheeled trees (for wheeled operads), simply connected graphs (for dioperads), half-graphs (for half-props), unital trees (for symmetric operads), and unitial linear graphs (for small categories). The pasting scheme for connected wheel-free graphs (for properads) does *not* satisfy this condition.

We furthermore prove, assuming $\mathcal{G}$ is shrinkable, that a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen equivalence between two base categories induces a Quillen equivalence between their categories of $\mathcal{G}$-props.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 3
3. Shrinkable Pasting Schemes 9
4. Relative Left Properness 14
5. Derived Change-of-Base Categories 22
References 30

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been much recent work in determining when certain categories of operad-like objects admit Quillen model category structures [JY09, Mur11, Fre10, DK, BB14], or more generally for algebras over operad-like objects [BM07, JY09]. This occurs in particular when the ground category $\mathcal{M}$ is especially nice; that is, when $\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated monoidal model category, every object of $\mathcal{M}$ is

cofibrant, and $\mathcal{M}$ admits functorial path data. Examples of such $\mathcal{M}$ include simplicial sets, symmetric spectra, and chain complexes in characteristic zero.

In this paper we are not much concerned with the *existence* of such model structures (we actually abstract it away in definition 2.16), but rather in the *properties* of the model structures when they exist.

For instance, one might ask about the properties of the model category of operads in $\mathcal{M}$. If we are discussing *non-symmetric* operads, then this model structure is left-proper [Mur14], meaning that weak equivalences are preserved by pushouts along cofibrations. We also know that the category of symmetric operads is Quillen-equivalent to a left proper model category by [Rez02]. In [HRY14], we provided an example of Dwyer to show that left-properness does *not* hold for the category of symmetric operads itself. However, the category of symmetric operads does satisfy a weaker notion called *relative left properness* [HRY14]. The goal of this paper is to generalize this to other types of operad-like objects.

The main such operad-like structure that we address in this paper is that of wheeled properads [MMS09] (although our theorems also apply to dioperads [Gan04] and wheeled operads, in addition to the previously known cases of operads and categories). Wheeled properads control (bi)-algebraic structures with traces, such as Frobenius algebras and unimodular Lie 1-bialgebras. These ideas have proven fruitful in geometric situations related to mathematical physics, for instance to formal quasi-classical split quantum BV manifolds [Mer10b].

The following is a special case of our first main theorem 4.11.

Theorem. *Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a monoidal model category which is especially nice (as above). Then the model category structure on the category of wheeled properads in $\mathcal{M}$ is relatively left proper, in the sense that whenever we have a pushout diagram of wheeled properads*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \rightarrowtail & X \\ {\scriptstyle \simeq}\downarrow & & \downarrow \\ B & \rightarrowtail & Y \end{array}$$

with $A \rightarrowtail X$ a cofibration and $A \xrightarrow{\simeq} B$ a weak equivalence, if A and B are both Σ-cofibrant then the map $X \longrightarrow Y$ is also a weak equivalence.

A similar theorem holds for dioperads, wheeled operads, and so on.

As soon as we are examining wheeled properads over general base categories, we can ask what happens when we modify the underlying category. Schwede and Shipley showed that, in favorable situations, a Quillen equivalence of the base categories induces a Quillen equivalence on the categories of monoids [SS03]. Muro extended this in [Mur14] to show that such a Quillen equivalence also induces a

Quillen equivalence on the category of nonsymmetric operads. The following is a special case of our second main theorem 5.8.

Theorem. *Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are monoidal model categories which are especially nice. Then a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen equivalence $\mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N}$ induces a Quillen equivalence between the associated categories of wheeled properads.*

The right adjoint of the induced Quillen equivalence is defined entrywise, while the left adjoint is more subtle; this will be carefully constructed in section 5.

We heavily use the language of generalized props from [YJ15], which allows us to treat many cases simultaneously. Two cases of interest which are *not* addressed by the present paper are properads and props. There is a technical condition on pasting schemes, called "shrinkability", which simplifies many constructions and arguments. We exploit it extensively here. It would be interesting to see if the corresponding results held for properads and props.

It would also be interesting to see if the theorems from this paper could extend to *topological* examples. As it stands, we restrict to base categories where all objects are cofibrant, excluding cases such as the category of compactly generated Hausdorff spaces. Perhaps alternative arguments in key places could pick up this case as well.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **(Model) Categorical Assumptions.** In this section we fix notation and definitions which our underlying categories satisfy.

Definition 2.2 ([Hir03] (11.1.2))**.** A model category $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be cofibrantly generated if there exist

(1) a set I of generating cofibrations which permits the small object argument [Hir03] (10.5.15) such that a map is an acyclic fibration if and only if it has the right lifting property with respect to every element of I.
(2) a set J of generating acyclic cofibrations which permits the small object argument such that a map is a fibration if and only if it has the right lifting property with respect to every element of J.

Notation 2.3. In general, when discussing closed symmetric monoidal categories [Mac98, VII], we will write $\otimes$ for the monoidal product, $\mathbb{1}$ for the tensor unit, and $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y)$ for the internal hom object.

The following definition is [SS03] (3.1).

Definition 2.4. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a model category. If $\mathcal{M}$ is also a closed symmetric monoidal category, we say that $\mathcal{M}$ is a **monoidal model category** if it satisfies the following two axioms.

Pushout product: For each pair of cofibrations $f : A \longrightarrow B$, $g : K \longrightarrow L$, the map

$$f \,\square\, g : A \otimes L \coprod_{A \otimes K} B \otimes K \longrightarrow B \otimes L$$

is also a cofibration. If, in addition, one of f or g is a weak equivalence, then so is $f \,\square\, g$.

Unit: If $q : \mathbb{1}^c \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{1}$ is a cofibrant replacement of the unit object, then for every cofibrant object A,

$$q \otimes \mathrm{Id} : \mathbb{1}^c \otimes A \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes A \cong A$$

is a weak equivalence.

Convention 2.5. For the rest of the paper, all model categories $\mathcal{M}$ will be monoidal model categories which are cofibrantly generated by some chosen sets of generating (acyclic) cofibrations I (resp. J).

2.6. **Graphs and Pasting Schemes.** We will briefly give the necessary definitions and notations regarding colored objects in $\mathcal{M}$. A more complete discussion of the following definitions can be found in [YJ15].

Definition 2.7 (Colored Objects)**.** Fix a non-empty set of **colors**, $\mathfrak{C}$.

(1) A $\mathfrak{C}$**-profile** is a finite sequence of elements in $\mathfrak{C}$,
$$\underline{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_m) = c_{[1,m]}$$
with each $c_i \in \mathfrak{C}$. If $\mathfrak{C}$ is clear from the context, then we simply say **profile**. The empty $\mathfrak{C}$-profile is denoted $\varnothing$, which is not to be confused with the initial object in $\mathcal{M}$. Write $|\underline{c}| = m$ for the **length** of a profile $\underline{c}$.
(2) An object in the product category $\prod_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is called a $\mathfrak{C}$**-colored object in** $\mathcal{M}$; similarly a map of $\mathfrak{C}$-colored objects is a map in $\prod_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{M}$. A typical $\mathfrak{C}$-colored object X is also written as $\{X_a\}$ with $X_a \in \mathcal{M}$ for each color $a \in \mathfrak{C}$.
(3) Fix $c \in \mathfrak{C}$. An $X \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is said to be **concentrated in the color** c if $X_d = \varnothing$ for all $c \neq d \in \mathfrak{C}$.
(4) For $f : X \longrightarrow Y \in \mathcal{M}$ we say that f is said to be **concentrated in the color** c if both X and Y are concentrated in the color c.

Definition 2.8. A *graph* G consists of

- a directed, connected, non-empty graph G with half-edges (also called 'flags'),
- listings on the inputs and outputs of the graph
$$\ell_G : (\mathsf{in}G; \mathsf{out}G) \xrightarrow{\cong} (1, \ldots, |\mathsf{in}G|; 1, \ldots, |\mathsf{out}G|)$$
and
- listings on the inputs and outputs of each vertex $v \in \mathsf{Vt}(G)$
$$\ell_v : (\mathsf{in}v; \mathsf{out}v) \xrightarrow{\cong} (1, \ldots, |\mathsf{in}v|; 1, \ldots, |\mathsf{out}v|)$$



FIGURE 1. An exceptional edge, an exceptional loop, and a corolla (graphics from [YJ15])

If, in addition, we have a coloring function $\xi : \mathsf{Edge}(G) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ to some set $\mathfrak{C}$, then we say that G is a $\mathfrak{C}$-*colored graph*.

- A **weak isomorphism** $G \longrightarrow G'$ between two $\mathfrak{C}$-colored graphs is a isomorphism which preserves the graph structure and the coloring, but not necessarily the listings.
- The collection of graphs with weak isomorphisms forms a groupoid which we denote by $\mathtt{Gr}_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\circlearrowleft}$.

Example 2.9. See figure 1.

- If $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, then there is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored graph $\uparrow_c$ which has profiles $(c;c)$, no vertices, and a single edge.
- If $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, then there is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored graph $\circlearrowleft_c$ which has profiles $(\varnothing;\varnothing)$, no vertices, and a single c-colored edge.
- If $(\underline{c};\underline{d}) = (c_{[1,m]};d_{[1,n]})$ is a pair of $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles, then there is **standard corolla** $C_{(\underline{c};\underline{d})}$ with
  - one vertex v;
  - $m+n$ flags, with inputs $\{1^i, 2^i, \ldots, m^i\}$ and outputs $\{1^o, \ldots, n^o\}$;
  - $\ell_G(k^i) = \ell_v(k^i) = k$ and $\ell_G(k^o) = \ell_v(k^o) = k$; and
  - $\xi(k^i) = c_k$ and $\xi(k^o) = d_k$.

Definition 2.10 (Graph operations)**.** Suppose that G is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored graph with profiles $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$.

- If, for each $v \in \mathsf{Vt}(G)$, H_v is a graph with profiles $\binom{\mathsf{out}(v)}{\mathsf{in}(v)}$, then the **graph substitution**
$$G\{H_v\}_{v\in\mathsf{Vt}(G)}$$
is the graph obtained from G by
  - replacing each vertex $v \in \mathsf{Vt}(G)$ with the graph H_v, and
  - identifying the legs of H_v with the incoming/outgoing flags of v.

  See figure 2.
- The input extension G_{in} is the graph with profiles $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$ where we graft a corolla $C_{(c_i;c_i)}$ onto the input leg $\ell_G^{-1}(i)$. See figure 3.
- The output extension G_{out} is the graph with profiles $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$ where we graft a corolla $C_{(d_i;d_i)}$ onto the output leg $\ell_G^{-1}(i)$.



FIGURE 2. Graph substitution (from [HR])

Definition 2.11 (Groupoid of profiles)**.** Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a non-empty set.

(1) If $\underline{a}$ and $\underline{b}$ are $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles, then a **map** (or **left permutation**) $\sigma : \underline{a} \longrightarrow \underline{b}$ is a permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_{|\underline{a}|}$ such that
$$\sigma\underline{a} = (a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}) = \underline{b}$$
This necessarily implies $|\underline{a}| = |\underline{b}| = m$.
(2) The **groupoid of $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles**, which has objects the $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles, and left permutations as the isomorphisms, is denoted by $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$. The opposite groupoid, $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}}$, is the groupoid of $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles with **right permutations**
$$\underline{a}\sigma = (a_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, a_{\sigma(m)})$$
as isomorphisms.

A subcategory C' of a category C is called **replete** if, for each object $c' \in C'$ and each isomorphism $c' \longrightarrow c$ in C, the object c is also in C'.

Definition 2.12 (Pasting Scheme)**.** A $\mathfrak{C}$-colored (connected, unital) pasting scheme is a pair
$$\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$$
in which

(1) S is a replete and full subcategory of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$, and
(2) $\mathtt{G}$ is a replete and full sub-groupoid of $\mathtt{Gr}_{\mathfrak{C}}^{\square}$

such that:

(1) $\mathcal{G}$ is closed under graph substitution,
(2) $\mathtt{G}$ contains all the $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$-corollas for all pairs of profiles $(\underline{c};\underline{d}) \in S$,
(3) if $(\underline{c};\underline{d}) \in S$ and $C = C_{(\underline{c};\underline{d})}$ is the $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$-corolla, then the input extension C_{in} and the output extension C_{out} are both in $\mathtt{G}$ (see figure 3), and



FIGURE 3. The input extension G_{in} and output extension G_{out}

(4) if $c \in S$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{C}$, then $(c;c) \in S$ and $\uparrow_c \in \mathtt{G}$.

Definition 2.13 (Colored Symmetric Sequences)**.** Fix a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored pasting scheme [YJ15] (Def. 8.2).

(1) The **orbit** of a profile $\underline{a}$ is denoted by $[\underline{a}]$. The maximal connected subgroupoid of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$ containing $\underline{a}$ is written as $\Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}$. Its objects are the left permutations of $\underline{a}$. There is an **orbit decomposition** of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}$

$$\Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}} \cong \coprod_{[\underline{a}] \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{C}}} \Sigma_{[\underline{a}]}, \tag{2.13.1}$$

where there is one coproduct summand for each orbit $[\underline{a}]$ of a $\mathfrak{C}$-profile.

(2) Define the diagram category

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{S}, \tag{2.13.2}$$

whose objects are called $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$**-objects in** $\mathcal{M}$. The decomposition (2.13.1) implies that there is a decomposition

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{M} \cong \prod_{([\underline{c}];[\underline{d}]) \in S} \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{[\underline{d}]}}. \tag{2.13.3}$$

(3) For $X \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{M}$, we write

$$X\left(\begin{smallmatrix}[\underline{d}]\\ [\underline{c}]\end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[\underline{c}]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{[\underline{d}]}} \tag{2.13.4}$$

for its $([\underline{c}];[\underline{d}])$-component. For $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\underline{d}\\ \underline{c}\end{smallmatrix}\right) \in S$ (both $\underline{c}$ and $\underline{d}$ are $\mathfrak{C}$-profiles), we write

$$X\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\underline{d}\\ \underline{c}\end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathcal{M} \tag{2.13.5}$$

for the value of X at $(\underline{c};\underline{d})$.

Unless otherwise specified, we will assume that $\mathfrak{C}$ is a fixed, non-empty set of colors, and $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored pasting scheme.

2.14. **$\mathcal{G}$-Props as Colored Operadic Algebras.** For a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored operad O in $\mathcal{M}$ (see [YJ15] 11.14 or [Yau16] 11.2.1), denote by $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O})$ the category of O-algebras ([YJ15] 13.37 or [Yau16] 13.3.2). Limits of $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O})$ are taken in the underlying category of $\mathfrak{C}$-colored objects $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ via the free-forgetful adjoint pair

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}} \rightleftarrows \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{O}).$$

Here $\circ$ is the $\mathfrak{C}$-colored version of the circle product for operads, which in single-colored form first appeared in [Rez96]. Detailed description of the general colored version of $\circ$ can be found in [WY15] (3.2).

The category of $\mathfrak{C}$-colored objects, $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$, admits a cofibrantly generated model category structure where weak equivalences, fibrations, and cofibrations are defined entrywise, as described in [Hir03] (11.1.10). In this model category a generating cofibration in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}} = \prod_{\mathfrak{C}} \mathcal{M}$ (i.e., a map in I) is a generating cofibration of $\mathcal{M}$, concentrated in one entry. Similarly, the set of generating acyclic cofibrations is $\mathsf{J} \times \mathfrak{C}$. In addition, the properties of being simplicial, or proper, are inherited from $\mathcal{M}$.

Recall, from Section 14.1 of [YJ15], the $|S|$-colored operad $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}$ (there called $\overline{U}_{\mathcal{G}}$) controlling $\mathcal{G}$-props. The elements of $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}$ are graphs with ordered sets of vertices, and operadic composition is given by graph substitution. The following is Lemma 14.4 in [YJ15].

Lemma 2.15. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a bicomplete symmetric monoidal closed category, and $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathfrak{G})$ is a pasting scheme* [YJ15] *(Def. 8.2). Then there is an S-colored operad $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ such that there is a canonical isomorphism of categories*

$$\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}} \cong \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}})$$

between:

- *the category $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ of $\mathcal{G}$-props in $\mathcal{M}$* [YJ15] *(Def. 10.39) and*
- *the category $\mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}})$ of algebras over the colored operad $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Definition 2.16. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a monoidal model category which is cofibrantly generated with set of generating cofibrations I and set of generating acyclic cofibrations J. If $\mathcal{G}$ is a pasting scheme, we say $\mathcal{G}$ **is admissible in** $\mathcal{M}$ if $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}} \cong \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}})$ admits a cofibrantly generated model structure, in which:

- fibrations and weak equivalences are created entrywise in $\mathcal{M}$, and
- the set of generating (acyclic) cofibrations is $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ \mathsf{I}$ (resp., $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ \mathsf{J}$), where I (resp., J) is the set of generating (acyclic) cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}^{|S|}$.

Bicompleteness is automatic by [WY15] (4.2.1), with reflexive coequalizers and filtered colimits preserved and created by the forgetful functor $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{|S|}$. For certain choices of $\mathcal{M}$, such as compactly generated Hausdorff spaces, simplicial sets, and symmetric spectra (with the projective model structure) we know that each pasting scheme $\mathcal{G}$ is admissible in $\mathcal{M}$ by [BM07] (2.1). Another important



FIGURE 4. Shrinking away a loop e

example is when $\mathcal{M}$ is the category of unbounded chain complexes in characteristic zero. By [Fre10] (5.3), $\mathcal{M}$ = Ch admits 'functorial path data', which is the key to showing that every $\mathcal{G}$ is admissible in $\mathcal{M}$ by an argument similar to [BM07] (2.1) (transfer of cofibrantly generated model category structure across an adjunction [Hir03] (11.3.2)); see [HRY14] for more details.

Remark 2.17. We have phrased everything above as a lifting of the model structure from $\mathcal{M}^{|S|}$. This is purely for convenience, to match the existing literature. One could instead regard $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}$ as a kind of operad which is colored by the *groupoid* S (rather than the *set* $|S|$) and most of the theory should still go through, lifting from the model structure on $\mathcal{M}^S$ (11.6.1) [Hir03]. It seems that the benefits of doing so are minimal, as all maps in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ are already in $\mathcal{M}^S$ and the fibrations and weak equivalences in $\mathcal{M}^S$ are detected entrywise, just as in $\mathcal{M}^{|S|}$. We will thus usually assume we are working in the subcategory $\mathcal{M}^S$ rather than in $\mathcal{M}^{|S|}$ for the remainder of the paper.

3. SHRINKABLE PASTING SCHEMES

Convention 3.1. The book [YJ15] is our general reference for graphs. From this point forward, by a *graph* we mean a strict isomorphism class [YJ15] (Def. 4.1) of a wheeled graph in the sense of [YJ15] (Def. 1.29). Graph substitution of strict isomorphism classes of graphs is well-defined, strictly associative, and unital by [YJ15] (Lemma 5.31 and Theorem 5.32).

Fix a non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ of colors once and for all. From now on we only work with connected pasting schemes. Recall from [YJ15] (Def. 4.15) that a *weak* isomorphism of graphs is a bijection of flags that preserves all the graph structures except possibly the listings at the vertices and the full graphs. Also recall that an *ordinary* internal edge is an edge that is neither an exceptional edge $\uparrow$ nor an exceptional loop $\circlearrowright$.

If e is an internal edge in a graph G, then shrinking away e results in a new graph G'. If e is a loop, G' is obtained by deleting e from G (Figure 4); otherwise we must first identify the two vertices of e (Figure 5). Note that shrinking an internal edge is not an operation which comes from graph substitution (Example 6.9) [YJ15].



FIGURE 5. Shrinking away the internal edge e

If $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and e is an ordinary internal edge of G, then shrinking e may or may not give us a graph which is still in $\mathcal{G}$; for example the chunk on the left in Figure 5 may be part of a graph in $\mathtt{Gr}^{\uparrow}$, while the chunk on the right cannot be.

Definition 3.2. Suppose given a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored *connected* pasting scheme $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$, i.e., $\mathcal{G} \leq \mathtt{Gr}_c^{\circledcirc}$ where $\mathtt{Gr}_c^{\circledcirc}$ is the pasting scheme of all $\mathfrak{C}$-colored connected wheeled graphs [YJ15] (Notation 4.26 and Def. 8.3). Then $\mathcal{G}$ is called **shrinkable** if it is closed under the operation of shrinking an ordinary internal edge.

The reader is referred to [YJ15] (Sec. 8.1) for notations regarding the following pasting schemes.

Proposition 3.3. *The following $\mathfrak{C}$-colored pasting schemes are shrinkable.*

(1) $\mathtt{Gr}_c^{\circledcirc}$ = *connected wheeled pasting scheme (for wheeled properads)*
(2) $\mathtt{Tree}^{\circledcirc}$ = *wheeled tree pasting scheme (for wheeled operads)*
(3) $\mathtt{Gr}_{di}^{\uparrow}$ = *simply-connected pasting scheme (for dioperads)*
(4) $\mathtt{UTree}$ = *unital level trees pasting scheme (for operads)*
(5) $\mathtt{ULin}$ = *unital linear pasting scheme (for small categories)*

Proof. For the first two pasting schemes, since loops and other directed cycles are allowed, they are closed under deleting loops and shrinking an internal edge with distinct end vertices (which usually results in new loops). The last three pasting schemes are all contained in the simply-connected pasting scheme $\mathtt{Gr}_{di}^{\uparrow}$. That $\mathtt{Gr}_{di}^{\uparrow}$ is shrinkable is [YJ15] (Lemma 6.8). That the smaller pasting schemes are also shrinkable follows from the same argument with minor change of terminology. □

Example 3.4. The $\mathfrak{C}$-colored connected wheel-free pasting scheme $\mathtt{Gr}_c^{\uparrow}$ (for properads) is <u>not</u> shrinkable. For example, in the walnut graph [YJ15] (Example 1.41)



if either internal edge is shrunk, then the result has a loop



which does not belong to $\mathtt{Gr}_{\mathtt{c}}^{\uparrow}$ anymore.

Definition 3.5. Suppose given a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored pasting scheme $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$.

(1) A **marked graph** in $\mathcal{G}$ is a pair (G, ds) with
   - $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and
   - $\varnothing \neq \mathsf{ds} \subseteq \mathsf{Vt}(G)$.

   We will also say $(G, \mathsf{ds}) \in \mathcal{G}$ is a marked graph.
(2) Suppose (G, ds) is a marked graph in $\mathcal{G}$.
   - An element in ds is called a **distinguished vertex**.
   - Vertices in the complement

$$\mathsf{n}(G, \mathsf{ds}) = \mathsf{n}(G) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathsf{Vt}(G) \smallsetminus \mathsf{ds}$$

     are called **normal vertices**.
(3) A **weak isomorphism** $f : (G, \mathsf{ds}) \longrightarrow (G', \mathsf{ds}')$ between marked graphs is defined as a weak isomorphism $f : G \longrightarrow G' \in \mathcal{G}$ that induces a bijection $f : \mathsf{ds} \cong \mathsf{ds}'$ between the sets of distinguished vertices. A **well marked graph** is a marked graph (G, ds) in which every flag in a distinguished vertex is part of an internal edge whose other end vertex is normal.
(4) A **reduced marked graph** is a well marked graph in which there are no internal edges with both end vertices normal.

Remark 3.6. For a non-exceptional loop in a graph, the end vertices are equal. Thus, a reduced marked graph is precisely a marked graph that satisfies the following conditions:

(1) Every internal edge has one normal end vertex and one distinguished end vertex. Notice that this condition implies that there are no loops at any vertex.
(2) Every input or output leg of the graph is adjacent to a normal vertex.

When used in the context of generalized props, the wellness condition in reduced marked graphs are really about the units of the generalized props. In more concrete situations, one can see it in the filtrations in:

- [Lur09] (A.3.2.4, for small simplicial categories),
- [Mur11] (5.1, for 1-colored non-symmetric operads), and
- [SS00] (6.2, for monoids).

In these simply connected situations, wellness means that every distinguished vertex is bounded on both sides by normal vertices.

The following observation ensures that well marked graphs are closed under graph substitution.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{G}$ is a pasting scheme, and $K \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\mathsf{Vt}(K) \neq \varnothing$.*
- *For each $v \in \mathsf{Vt}(K)$, $(G_v, \mathsf{ds}_v) \in \mathcal{G}$ is a marked graph such that G_v has the same input/output profiles as v.*

Then:

(1) The graph substitution $H = K(\{G_v\}) \in \mathcal{G}$ is canonically a marked graph with set of distinguished vertices

$$\mathsf{ds}_H \overset{\text{def}}{=} \coprod_{v \in K} \mathsf{ds}_v.$$

(2) If each (G_v, ds_v) is a well marked graph, then (H, ds_H) is also a well marked graph.

Proof. The pair (H, ds_H) is a marked graph because $\mathsf{Vt}(K) \neq \varnothing$ and each $\mathsf{ds}_v \neq \varnothing$. For the second assertion, to see that it is a well marked graph, first note that a distinguished vertex $w \in \mathsf{ds}_H$ must be a distinguished vertex in some unique G_u. Since G_u is a well marked graph, every flag in w is part of an internal edge in G_u, hence an internal edge in H, whose other end vertex is normal in G_u, hence also normal in H. In this last sentence, we used the equalities

$$\mathsf{n}(H, \mathsf{ds}_H) = \mathsf{Vt}(H) \smallsetminus \mathsf{ds}_H = \coprod_{v \in K} \mathsf{Vt}(G_v) \smallsetminus \coprod_{v \in K} \mathsf{ds}_v = \coprod_{v \in K} \mathsf{n}(G_v, \mathsf{ds}_v)$$

to identify the normal vertices in H with those in the various G_v's. □

Remark 3.8. One must be careful that, in the context of the previous proposition, even if each (G_v, ds_v) is reduced, it does *not* follow in general that (H, ds_H) is reduced. In forming the graph substitution $H = K(\{G_v\})$, there are usually some internal edges that are not internal edges in any G_v. These new internal edges come from the legs of the G_v's that are connected in H by some internal edge in K. So such a new internal edge in H may connect a normal vertex w_u in some G_u with a normal vertex w_v in some G_v, where $G_u = G_v$ and even $w_u = w_v$ are allowed if the corresponding internal edge in K is a loop at v. In particular, H may not be reduced, although by the previous proposition it must be well marked. It does have a unique reduction up to weak isomorphism, as we will see in Corollary 3.11.

Remark 3.9. Consider a connected pasting scheme $\mathcal{G}$.

(1) $\mathcal{G}$ is shrinkable if and only if, for each internal edge e in an ordinary graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, the wheeled graph G/e obtained from G by shrinking away the internal edge e is still in $\mathcal{G}$. In forming G/e, the two flags that make up e are removed and the vertices to which they belong are redefined as a single vertex. When e is a loop at a vertex, G/e means G with e deleted. The rest of the graph structures in G/e are all canonically inherited from G. In particular, when e is an internal edge that is not a loop, the new combined vertex inherits the dioperadic listings from the two original end vertices of e as in [YJ15] (2.4.2).
(2) Shrinking two internal edges in a given graph–depending on the order in which they are shrunk–is well-defined only up to weak isomorphism. One can see this from, for example, [YJ15] (Lemma 6.106). In trying to shrink two internal edges from two distinct vertices going into a third vertex, the outgoing listing of the combined vertex may need to be corrected with a block permutation, depending on the order in which the internal edges are shrunk. This is why marked graphs are considered with *weak isomorphisms* preserving the distinguished vertices.
(3) In general, if $E \subseteq \mathsf{Edge}(G)$ is a non-empty subset of ordinary internal edges, then G/E–that is, G with all $e \in E$ shrunk–is uniquely defined up to vertex listings, but its graph listing must be that of G. In other words, remove all the flags corresponding to all $e \in E$, combine all the affected vertices connected to each other into a single vertex, and let it inherit as much graph structure from G as possible. The only structure that is not uniquely defined in such a G/E is the set of vertex listings for the newly formed vertices. Given any such choice of G/E, there is a unique graph substitution decomposition
$$G = (G/E)\big(\{H\}\big) \tag{3.9.1}$$
in which the internal edges in the H's form precisely the set E. Choosing a different representative of G/E (by changing some listings of the newly formed vertices) can only change the graph listings, but *not* vertex listings, of the H's. So given $E \subseteq \mathsf{Edge}(G)$, the H's are uniquely defined up to graph listings. This is essentially explained in [YJ15] (Lemma 6.8), although that was stated for simply-connected graphs.
(4) In the setting of the decomposition (3.9.1), for $A \in \mathcal{M}^S$, each object
$$A(H) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{v \in H} A^{\binom{\mathsf{out}(v)}{\mathsf{in}(v)}}$$
is well defined because each H is unique up to graph listings and $A(H)$ only uses the vertex listings in H.

The following observation ensures that one can go from a well marked graph to a reduced marked graph uniquely.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{G}$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme (Def. 3.2).*
- *$(G, \mathsf{ds}) \in \mathcal{G}$ is a well marked graph.*
- *$E \subseteq \mathsf{Edge}(G)$ is the subset of all the internal edges with both end vertices normal.*

Then there is a unique weak isomorphism class of reduced marked graphs $[(G/E, \mathsf{ds})]$ in which G/E is obtained from G by shrinking all $e \in E$.

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of $[(G/E, \mathsf{ds})]$ was explained in the previous remark (3.9.1). It has the same set of distinguished vertices because, in shrinking the internal edges in E, no distinguished vertices are affected.

Next observe that $(G/E, \mathsf{ds})$ is a well marked graph. Indeed, a flag f in a distinguished vertex w in G/E must still be part of an internal edge because it was so in G and it is not shrunk in forming G/E. Moreover, the other end vertex of f in G is a normal vertex, which is either unaffected in passing to G/E or is combined with some other normal vertices in G to form a normal vertex in G/E. In any case, the other end vertex of f in G/E is a normal vertex.

Finally, to see that $(G/E, \mathsf{ds})$ is reduced, note that normal vertices in G/E come from those in G as discussed in the previous paragraph. So G/E cannot have any internal edge with both end vertices normal because E is by definition the set of *all* the internal edges in G with both end vertices normal. □

Corollary 3.11. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{G}$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme, and $K \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\mathsf{Vt}(K) \neq \varnothing$.*
- *For each $v \in \mathsf{Vt}(K)$, $(G_v, \mathsf{ds}_v) \in \mathcal{G}$ is a well marked graph (e.g., reduced marked graph) such that G_v has the same input/output profiles as v.*
- *$\big(H = K(\{G_v\}), \mathsf{ds}_H\big)$ is the marked graph in Proposition 3.7.*

Then there is a unique weak isomorphism class of reduced marked graphs $[(H', \mathsf{ds}_H)]$ in which H' is obtained from H by shrinking all the internal edges with both end vertices normal.

Proof. By Proposition 3.7 (H, ds_H) is a well marked graph. It has a unique reduction up to weak isomorphism by Proposition 3.10. □

4. Relative Left Properness

In this section, we show that, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme admissible in $\mathcal{M}$ and all objects of $\mathcal{M}$ are cofibrant, then the model category structure on $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ in Corollary 2.16 satisfies a property close to that of left properness, which we will refer to as **relative** left properness.

Fix a $\mathfrak{C}$-colored pasting scheme $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ for some non-empty set $\mathfrak{C}$ of colors and a bicomplete symmetric monoidal closed category $(\mathcal{M}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$.

4.1. **Vertex Decoration.**

Definition 4.2. Suppose $(G, \mathsf{ds}) \in \mathcal{G}$ is a marked graph, and $A \in \mathcal{M}^S$ (2.13.2).

(1) For $u \in \mathsf{Vt}(G)$, write $A(u)$ for the entry of A corresponding to the profiles of u. In other words, if u has profile $(\underline{c}; \underline{d}) \in S$, then
$$A(u) = A\binom{\underline{d}}{\underline{c}} \in \mathcal{M}.$$
(2) Define the object
$$A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) = A\big(\mathsf{n}(G, \mathsf{ds})\big) = \bigotimes_{u \in \mathsf{n}(G, \mathsf{ds})} A(u) \in \mathcal{M},$$
where $\mathsf{n}(G, \mathsf{ds}) = \mathsf{Vt}(G) \smallsetminus \mathsf{ds}$ is the set of normal vertices.
(3) Write $[(G, \mathsf{ds})]$ for the isomorphism class of (G, ds) in $\mathcal{G}$.

4.3. **The Pushout Filtration.** If $H \longrightarrow G$ is a homomorphism of groups, then the restriction functor $\mathcal{M}^G \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}^H$ has a left adjoint, called **induction**,
$$G \underset{H}{.} (-) : \mathcal{M}^H \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}^G.$$
Restriction and induction are actually a Quillen pair; see [BM06] (2.5.1). The following definition appears in [EM06] (Sec. 12) and [Har10] (7.10).

Definition 4.4 (Q-Construction)**.** Suppose there is a map $i : X \longrightarrow Y \in \mathcal{M}$, and $0 \le q \le t$. The object $Q^t_q = Q^t_q(i) \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_t}$ is defined as follows.

- $Q^t_0 = X^{\otimes t}$.
- $Q^t_t = Y^{\otimes t}$.
- For $0 < q < t$ there is a pushout in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_t}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_t \underset{\Sigma_{t-q}\times\Sigma_q}{.} \left[X^{\otimes(t-q)} \otimes Q^q_{q-1}\right] & \longrightarrow & Q^t_{q-1} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\mathrm{id}, i^{\square q})} & & \downarrow \\ \Sigma_t \underset{\Sigma_{t-q}\times\Sigma_q}{.} \left[X^{\otimes(t-q)} \otimes Y^{\otimes q}\right] & \longrightarrow & Q^t_q. \end{array} \tag{4.4.1}$$

Write $i^{\square t}$ for the natural map $Q^t_{t-1} \longrightarrow Y^{\otimes t}$. It is an iterated pushout product of i.

Recall the definition of a pasting scheme being admissible in a monoidal model category $\mathcal{M}$ (Def. 2.16) and the definition of a shrinkable pasting scheme (Def. 3.2). The following filtration is completely categorical and requires no model category structure.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{G}$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme, $A \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and*
- *$i : X \longrightarrow Y \in \mathcal{M}$, regarded as a map in $\mathcal{M}^S$ concentrated in the s-entry for some $s \in S$.*

- *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ X & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ {\scriptstyle i_*}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ Y & \longrightarrow & A_\infty \end{array} \tag{4.5.1}$$

  is a pushout in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$.
- $[r] = \binom{[d]}{[c]} \in S$ *is an orbit.*

Then the $[r]$*-entry of the map* h *is a countable composition*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} A_0([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_1} & A_1([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_2} & A_2([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_3} & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim}_k A_k([r]) \\ \| & & & & & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \cong} \\ A([r]) & & & & & & & & A_\infty([r]) \end{array} \tag{4.5.2}$$

in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}} = \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[c]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{[d]}}$*, where for* $k \geq 1$ *the maps* h_k *are inductively defined as the pushout*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \coprod_{[(G,\mathsf{ds})]} \Sigma_{[r]} \underset{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})}{\cdot} \left\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \right\} & \xrightarrow{f_*^{k-1}} & A_{k-1}([r]) \\ {\scriptstyle \amalg(\mathrm{Id} \otimes i^{\square k})_*}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h_k} \\ \coprod_{[(G,\mathsf{ds})]} \Sigma_{[r]} \underset{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})}{\cdot} \left\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Y^{\otimes k} \right\} & \xrightarrow{\xi_k} & A_k([r]) \end{array} \tag{4.5.3}$$

in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}} = \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[c]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{[d]}}$*. In this pushout:*

(1) The coproducts are indexed by the set of weak isomorphism classes $[(G, \mathsf{ds})]$ *of* <u>*reduced*</u> *marked graphs such that:*
  - *the input/output profile of* G *is in the orbit* $[r]$*;*
  - ds *consists of* k *vertices, all with profiles in the orbit* $[s]$*.*

(2) The top horizontal map f_*^{k-1} *is induced by* f *and the* $\mathcal{G}$*-prop structure maps of* A [YJ15] *(Lemma 10.40).*

(3) $\Sigma_{[r]} = \Sigma_{[c]}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \Sigma_{[d]}$.

Proof. Define

$$B([r]) = \operatorname*{colim}_k A_k([r]) \in \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}.$$

Corollary 3.11 and the $\mathcal{G}$-prop structure maps of A imply that B has a canonical $\mathcal{G}$-prop structure together with a $\mathcal{G}$-prop map $A \longrightarrow B$ induced by $A_0 \longrightarrow B$. The map $Y \longrightarrow B$ is induced by:

- ξ_1 using the input and output extension [YJ15] (6.10 and 6.11) of the s-corolla whose only vertex is distinguished;

- the color units of A;
- the natural map $A_1 \longrightarrow B$.

That B is the pushout A_∞ follows from its inductive definition. □

Remark 4.6. Suppose $C = C_{(\underline{c};\underline{d})}$ is a corolla with the indicated profiles [YJ15] (1.31) and with unique vertex w. Then its input and output extension mentioned in the previous proof is the spider graph:



It is obtained from C by attaching to every leg a 1-input, 1-output corolla with equal flag colors. In the previous proof, w is distinguished with profiles $s = (\underline{c};\underline{d})$, and the newly attached vertices v_i's and x_j's are all normal vertices to be used with the colored units of A.

Definition 4.7. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a cofibrantly generated model category, and $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a pasting scheme.

(1) An object $A \in \mathcal{M}^S$ is called $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$**-cofibrant** in $\mathcal{M}$ if A is cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}^S$.
(2) A map in $\mathcal{M}^S$ is called a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$**-cofibration** in $\mathcal{M}$ if it is a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}^S$.
(3) If C is a small category, a C**-cofibration** (resp., a C**-cofibrant object**) is a cofibration (resp., a cofibrant object) in the diagram category $\mathcal{M}^C$ with the projective model structure [Hir03] (11.6.1).

Remark 4.8. Recall that there is a decomposition (2.13.3)

$$\mathcal{M}^S \cong \prod_{([\underline{c}];[\underline{d}])\in S} \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma^{\mathrm{op}}_{[\underline{c}]}\times\Sigma_{[\underline{d}]}}.$$

So $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant/cofibration means the $[r]$-entry in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$ is $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant/cofibration as $[r]$ runs through all the orbits in S.

Next we provide a homotopical analysis of the filtration (4.5.2).

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose:*

- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in* $\mathcal{M}$.
- *Every object of* $\mathcal{M}$ *is cofibrant.*

- *$i : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$, regarded as a map in $\mathcal{M}^S$ concentrated at the s-entry for some $s \in S$.*
- *$A \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant.*
- *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ X & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ {\scriptstyle i_*}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ Y & \longrightarrow & A_\infty \end{array} \tag{4.9.1}$$

is a pushout in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$.

Then:

(1) *Each map*

$$A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id} \otimes i^{\square k}} A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Y^{\otimes k}$$

on the left side of the pushout (4.5.3) *is an $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathsf{ds})$-cofibration between $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant objects.*

(2) *Each map*

$$\Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \Big\} \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{Id} \otimes i^{\square k})_*} \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Y^{\otimes k} \Big\}$$

on the left side of the pushout (4.5.3) *is a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects.*

(3) *The map*

$$\coprod_{[(G,\mathsf{ds})]} \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \Big\} \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{Id} \otimes i^{\square k})_*} \coprod_{[(G,\mathsf{ds})]} \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{ A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Y^{\otimes k} \Big\}$$

on the left side of the pushout (4.5.3) *is a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects.*

(4) *The map $h_k : A_{k-1}([r]) \longrightarrow A_k([r])$ on the right side of the pushout* (4.5.3) *is a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects.*

(5) *The map $h : A \longrightarrow A_\infty$ is a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props.*

Proof. For (1), in the pushout (4.5.3), within each coproduct summand on the left side, an automorphism of (G, ds) can only:

- permute vertices with isomorphic incoming/outgoing profiles while preserving distinguished vertices,
- permute the incoming/outgoing flags of a vertex, or
- do a combination of the previous two items.

Since A is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant, $A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant. The pushout product axiom implies that the iterated pushout product $i^{\square k} : Q^k_{k-1} \longrightarrow Y^{\otimes k}$ is a cofibration

between cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$, since we are assuming that every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrant. Moreover, $i^{\square k}$ has an $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-action because weak isomorphisms preserve distinguished vertices. So Lemma 2.5.2 in [BM06] implies that the map $\mathrm{Id}\otimes i^{\square k}$ is an $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibration.

Furthermore, $A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant, and $Y^{\otimes k}$ is cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ and has an $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-action. So Lemma 2.5.2 in [BM06] implies that $A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Y^{\otimes k}$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant, and similarly $A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}$ is also $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant.

For (2), note that there is a left Quillen functor

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})}(?)} \mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}\ , \tag{4.9.2}$$

which is the left adjoint of the functor induced by restriction along $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})\longrightarrow\Sigma_{[r]}$. Applying this left Quillen functor to the map $\mathrm{Id}\otimes i^{\square k}$–which is an $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibration between $\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})$-cofibrant objects by (1)–yields a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects.

For (3), note that taking a coproduct of the maps in (2) still gives a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration between $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects by [Hir03] (10.2.7 and 10.3.4).

For (4), the map h_k is the pushout of the map in (3), so it is a $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibration. An induction then shows that both its domain and codomain are $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant objects.

Assertion (5) follows from (4), that the orbit $[r]$ is arbitrary, and the fact that cofibrations are closed under transfinite compositions. □

The following observation says that the pushout of a weak equivalence between $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props along a map that is the pushout of a free cofibration, is again a weak equivalence between $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props.

Proposition 4.10. *Suppose:*

- $\mathcal{G}=(S,\mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which admissible in* $\mathcal{M}$.
- *Every object of* $\mathcal{M}$ *is cofibrant.*
- $i: X\longrightarrow Y$ *is a cofibration in* $\mathcal{M}$*, regarded as a map in* $\mathcal{M}^S$ *concentrated at the* s*-entry for some* $s\in S$.
- $f: A\longrightarrow B\in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ *is a weak equivalence between* $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$*-cofibrant* $\mathcal{G}$*-props.*
- *Both squares in the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}\circ X & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow[\sim]{f} & B \\ {\scriptstyle i_*}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle h^A}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h^B} \\ \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}}\circ Y & \longrightarrow & A_\infty & \xrightarrow{f_\infty} & B_\infty \end{array} \tag{4.10.1}$$

  in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ *are pushouts.*

Then f_∞ *is also a weak equivalence between* $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$*-cofibrant* $\mathcal{G}$*-props.*

Proof. Weak equivalences in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}} \cong \mathsf{Alg}(\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}})$ are created entrywise in $\mathcal{M}$. The outer rectangle in (4.10.1) is also a pushout. So each of the maps h^A and h^B is filtered, in which each $[r]$-entry, with $[r] \in S$ an arbitrary orbit, of the k-th map is a pushout as in (4.5.3). There is a commutative ladder diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
A([r]) & = & A_0([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_1^A} & A_1([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_2^A} & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim} A_k([r]) \cong A_\infty([r]) \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_1} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_\infty} \\
B([r]) & = & B_0([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_1^B} & B_1([r]) & \xrightarrow{h_2^B} & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \operatorname{colim} B_k([r]) \cong B_\infty([r])
\end{array} \tag{4.10.2}$$

in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$. All the horizontal maps h_k^A and h_k^B are cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$ by Proposition 4.9, and so all the objects in the ladder diagram are cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$. Using [Hir03] (15.10.12(1)), in order to show that the map f_∞ is a weak equivalence between cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$, it suffices to show that all the vertical maps f_k, with $0 \le k < \infty$, are weak equivalences by induction on k.

The map f_0 is the $[r]$-entry of f, which is a weak equivalence by assumption. Suppose $k \ge 1$. Consider the following commutative diagram in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$.



(4.10.3)

Both the back face (with A's) and the front face (with B's) are pushout squares as in (4.5.3), and the maps from the back square to the front square are all induced by f. The map f_{k-1} is a weak equivalence by the induction hypothesis. By Proposition 4.9, all the objects in the diagram are cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$, and the left vertical maps in the back and the front faces are cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$. So to show that the induced map f_k is a weak equivalence, it is enough to show, by the Cube Lemma [Hov99] (5.2.6) / [Hir03] (15.10.10), that both maps labeled as f_* are weak equivalences.

To see that the top f_* in the above diagram is a weak equivalence, note that a coproduct of weak equivalences between cofibrant objects is again a weak equivalence by Ken Brown's Lemma [Hov99] (1.1.12). Using the left Quillen functor (4.9.2) and Ken Brown's Lemma again, it is enough to show that, within each coproduct summand, the map

$$A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \xrightarrow{f_*} B\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \otimes Q^k_{k-1} \tag{4.10.4}$$

is a weak equivalence between $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathtt{ds})$-cofibrant objects. By Proposition 4.9 these are $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathtt{ds})$-cofibrant objects. Recall that weak equivalences in any diagram category in $\mathcal{M}$ are defined entrywise. The map

$$A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big) \xrightarrow{f_*} B\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)$$

is a finite tensor product of entries of f, each of which is a weak equivalence between cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. So this f_* is a weak equivalence between cofibrant objects, and tensoring this map with the cofibrant object Q^k_{k-1} yields a weak equivalence.

A similar argument with $Y^{\otimes k}$ in place of Q^k_{k-1} shows that the bottom f_* in the commutative diagram is also a weak equivalence. Therefore, as discussed above, f_k is a weak equivalence, finishing the induction. □

The following is the main theorem of this section, and one of two main theorems of the paper.

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in $\mathcal{M}$.
(2) Every object of $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrant.

Then the cofibrantly generated model structure on $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ in Corollary 2.16 is left proper relative to $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props, in the sense that pushouts along cofibrations preserve weak equivalences between $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props.

Proof. The set of generating cofibrations in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ is $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ \mathsf{I}$, where I is the set of generating cofibrations in $\mathcal{M}^{|S|}$, each of which is concentrated in one entry and is a generating cofibration of $\mathcal{M}$ there. A general cofibration in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ is a retract of a transfinite composition of pushouts of maps in $\mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ \mathsf{I}$. So a retract and induction argument reduces the proof to the situation in Proposition 4.10. □

The following observation says that cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-props are also $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant. It will be used in Proposition 5.6 below.

Proposition 4.12. *Suppose:*

- *$\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in $\mathcal{M}$.*
- *Every object of $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrant.*

- *P is a cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-prop.*

Then P is also a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant $\mathcal{G}$-prop.

Proof. Recall that $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ is cofibrantly generated (Definition 2.16). Since $P \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ is cofibrant, it is a retract of the colimit P_∞ in a transfinite composition

$$\varnothing = P_0 \xrightarrow{j_1} P_1 \xrightarrow{j_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \operatorname{colim}_k P_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_\infty \tag{4.12.1}$$

in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ starting at the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop $\varnothing$, in which each map $j_k : P_{k-1} \longrightarrow P_k$ is a pushout as in Proposition 4.9 with $i : X \longrightarrow Y$ a generating cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$. To show that P is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant, it is enough to show that P_∞ is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant. Moreover, the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant because every object in $\mathcal{M}$ is cofibrant; see (5.5.1) and (5.5.2) for an explicit description of the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop. Since cofibrations are closed under transfinite composition, it is enough to show that each map j_k for $k \geq 1$ is a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibration. This is true by Proposition 4.9(5) and an induction. □

5. Derived Change-of-Base Categories

The main result in this section is Theorem 5.8. It says that, under fairly reasonable assumptions, a Quillen equivalence between underlying categories induces a Quillen equivalence between the categories of $\mathcal{G}$-props.

Recall the definition of a pasting scheme being admissible in a monoidal model category $\mathcal{M}$ (Def. 2.16) and the definition of a shrinkable pasting scheme (Def. 3.2). We will also need the following definition, which appears in [SS03] (Section 3.2).

Definition 5.1 (Weak Monoidal Quillen Pairs)**.** Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are monoidal model categories.

- A **lax monoidal** structure on a functor $R : \mathcal{N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ consists of a morphism $\nu : \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow R(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}})$, and natural morphisms
$$RX \otimes RY \longrightarrow R(X \otimes Y)$$
which are coherently associative and unital.
- A **weak monoidal Quillen pair** between monoidal model categories $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ consists of a Quillen adjoint pair
$$L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$$
with a lax monoidal structure on the right adjoint R so that the following hold:
  - For all cofibrant objects A and B in $\mathcal{M}$, the map $L(A \otimes B) \longrightarrow LA \otimes LB$ (adjoint to $A \otimes B \longrightarrow RLA \otimes RLB \longrightarrow R(LA \otimes LB)$) is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{N}$.
  - For some cofibrant replacement $q : (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}})^c \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}}$, the composite map
$$L(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}})^c \xrightarrow{Lq} L\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \xrightarrow{\check{\nu}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}}$$

is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{N}$.

Examples of weak monoidal Quillen pairs include the adjunction between (nonnegatively-graded) chain complexes and simplicial abelian groups [SS03] (Section 3.4), as well as the adjunction between reduced rational dg Lie algebras and reduced rational simplicial Lie algebras [Qui69].

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose:*

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ *is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair with left adjoint* L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a pasting scheme which is admissible in* $\mathcal{M}$.

Then there is an induced diagram with four Quillen pairs

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}^S & \underset{R}{\overset{L}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathcal{N}^S \\ \Big\uparrow\Big\downarrow \text{free} & & \Big\uparrow\Big\downarrow \text{free} \\ \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}} & \underset{R}{\overset{L^{\mathcal{G}}}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}} \end{array} \tag{5.2.1}$$

in which the following statements hold:

(1) The Quillen pair (L, R) *in the top row of* (5.2.1) *is the entrywise prolongation of the original Quillen pair between* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$. *This* (L, R) *is a Quillen equivalence if the original adjoint pair between* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *is.*
(2) Both $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ *and* $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$ *have the model structures in Corollary 2.16.*
(3) Both vertical Quillen pairs are the free-forgetful adjunctions in [YJ15] *(12.9), in which the undecorated right adjoints forget all of the* $\mathcal{G}$*-prop structure except for the equivariant structure.*
(4) At the bottom row the right adjoint R *is the entrywise prolongation of the original right adjoint as in* [YJ15] *(12.11(1)).*
(5) The square of right adjoints commutes, and the square of left adjoints also commutes up to natural isomorphisms.
(6) If the original left adjoint L *is symmetric monoidal, then* $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ *is naturally isomorphic to the entrywise prolongation of* L.

Proof. The top and the vertical adjoint pairs exist as explained in the statements above. The bottom horizontal left adjoint $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ exists by the Adjoint Lifting Theorem [Bor94] (4.5.6). Every one of the four adjoint pairs is a Quillen pair because every right adjoint above preserves fibrations and acyclic fibrations, since they are defined entrywise in the underlying categories.

If the original adjoint pair (L, R) is a Quillen equivalence, then so is the top adjoint pair in (5.2.1) by [Hir03] (11.6.5(2)).

Furthermore, since both horizontal right adjoints are R entrywise and both vertical right adjoints are forgetful functors, the right adjoints square commutes. By

uniqueness of left adjoints, the left adjoints square also commutes up to natural isomorphisms.

If the original left adjoint $L : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is symmetric monoidal, then its entrywise prolongation is a functor $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$ and is left adjoint to the entrywise prolongation of R by [YJ15] (12.13). So there is a natural isomorphism $L^{\mathcal{G}} \cong L$ by uniqueness of left adjoints. □

The following definition is a way of measuring how different $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ is from L when the latter is not symmetric monoidal, but only weakly symmetric monoidal.

Definition 5.3. Suppose:

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair with left adjoint L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ is a (not necessarily shrinkable) pasting scheme which is admissible in both $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$.
- $P \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Denote by

$$LP \xrightarrow{\chi_P} L^{\mathcal{G}}P \in \mathcal{N}^S \tag{5.3.1}$$

the adjoint of the unit map $P \longrightarrow RL^{\mathcal{G}}P$ regarded in $\mathcal{M}^S$.

Remark 5.4. For simplicity we omitted all the forgetful functors in the map χ_P. Denoting by U the forgetful functors, the map χ_P is $LUP \longrightarrow UL^{\mathcal{G}}P$.

The following observation says that for the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop, $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ and L are not all that different. It will serve as the initial case in the induction in the proof of Proposition 5.7 below.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose:*

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ *is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair with left adjoint* L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in both* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$.
- *All objects of* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *are cofibrant.*
- P_0 *is the initial* $\mathcal{G}$*-prop in* $\mathcal{M}$.

Then the map $\chi_{P_0} : LP_0 \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0$ *is a weak equivalence.*

Proof. Since P_0 is the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop in $\mathcal{M}$, $L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0$ is the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop in $\mathcal{N}$ because $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ is a left adjoint. There are now two cases.

(1) Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is wheel-free, i.e., $\mathcal{G}$ is properly contained in $\mathtt{Gr}^{\uparrow}_{\mathtt{c}}$. Then

$$P_0\left(\begin{smallmatrix} d \\ \underline{c} \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} & \text{if } \left(\begin{smallmatrix} d \\ \underline{c} \end{smallmatrix}\right) = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} c \\ c \end{smallmatrix}\right), \\ \varnothing & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{5.5.1}$$

and similarly for $L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0$. For a color $c \in \mathfrak{C}$ for which $\uparrow_c \in \mathcal{G}$, the map χ_{P_0} at the $\binom{c}{c}$-entry is the counit map $L\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}}$, which is a weak equivalence as part of the definition of a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair because $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is cofibrant. In any other entry, the map χ_{P_0} is the unique self map of the initial object in $\mathcal{N}$.

(2) If $\mathcal{G}$ has wheels, then

$$P_0\tbinom{d}{\underline{c}} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} & \text{if } \tbinom{d}{\underline{c}} = \tbinom{c}{c}, \\ \coprod\limits_{\substack{c\in\mathfrak{C} \\ \text{s.t.}\uparrow_c\in\mathcal{G}}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} & \text{if } \tbinom{d}{\underline{c}} = \tbinom{\varnothing}{\varnothing}, \\ \varnothing & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{5.5.2}$$

and similarly for $L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0$. As in the wheel-free case, the map χ_{P_0} is either a weak equivalence or the identity map of the initial object in entries $\binom{d}{\underline{c}} \neq \binom{\varnothing}{\varnothing}$. At the $\binom{\varnothing}{\varnothing}$-entry, χ_{P_0} is the map

$$L\Big(\coprod \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}}\Big) \cong \coprod L\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \coprod \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}},$$

which is a coproduct of the counit map $L\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}}$. The counit map is a weak equivalence between cofibrant objects in $\mathcal{N}$, hence so is the coproduct.

This shows that the map χ_{P_0} is a weak equivalence. □

Roughly the following observation says that, if the map χ_A is a weak equivalence, then it remains so after we attach a free cell to A, provided A is cofibrant. It will serve as the induction step in the proof of Proposition 5.7 below.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose:*

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ *is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair with left adjoint* L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in both* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$.
- *All objects of* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *are cofibrant.*
- $i : X \longrightarrow Y$ *is a cofibration in* $\mathcal{M}$*, regarded as a map in* $\mathcal{M}^S$ *concentrated at the* s*-entry for some* $s \in S$.
- *The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ X & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ {\scriptstyle i_*}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle h} \\ \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ Y & \longrightarrow & A_\infty \end{array} \tag{5.6.1}$$

is a pushout in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}$ *with* A *cofibrant.*

- *The map* $\chi_A : LA \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}A$ *is a weak equivalence.*

Then the map $\chi_{A_\infty} : LA_\infty \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}A_\infty$ *is also a weak equivalence.*

Proof. Pick an orbit $[r] \in S$, and consider the filtration (4.5.2) in $\mathcal{M}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$

$$A([r]) = A_0([r]) \xrightarrow{h_1} A_1([r]) \xrightarrow{h_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \operatorname{colim}_k A_k([r]) \cong A_\infty([r])$$

of the $[r]$-entry of the map $h : A \longrightarrow A_\infty$. Applying the left adjoint L in the $[r]$-entry, we obtain the filtration in $\mathcal{N}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$

$$L(A[r]) = L(A_0[r]) \xrightarrow{Lh_1} L(A_1[r]) \xrightarrow{Lh_2} \cdots \longrightarrow \operatorname{colim}_k L(A_k[r]) \cong L(A_\infty[r])$$

of the map $(Lh)[r]$.

On the other hand, applying the left adjoint $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ to the pushout diagram (5.6.1) in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$, we obtain the pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ LX & \longrightarrow & L^{\mathcal{G}}A \overset{\text{def}}{=} B \\ {\scriptstyle (Li)_*}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle L^{\mathcal{G}}h} \\ \mathsf{Op}^{\mathcal{G}} \circ LY & \longrightarrow & L^{\mathcal{G}}A_\infty \overset{\text{def}}{=} B_\infty \end{array} \tag{5.6.2}$$

in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$. To obtain the left side, we used the fact that the left adjoints square in (5.2.1) commutes up to natural isomorphism. Applying Lemma 4.5 to this pushout diagram, we obtain a corresponding bottom horizontal filtration and a commutative ladder diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} L(A[r]) = L(A_0[r]) & \longrightarrow & L(A_1[r]) & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & L(A_\infty[r]) \\ {\scriptstyle \xi_0}\downarrow{\scriptstyle =\chi_A} & & {\scriptstyle \xi_1}\downarrow & & & & {\scriptstyle \xi_\infty}\downarrow{\scriptstyle =\chi_{A_\infty}} \\ (L^{\mathcal{G}}A)[r] = B[r] = B_0[r] & \longrightarrow & B_1[r] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & B_\infty[r] = (L^{\mathcal{G}}A_\infty)[r] \end{array} \tag{5.6.3}$$

in $\mathcal{N}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$.

Since $A \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is cofibrant, it is also $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ by Proposition 4.12, and hence LA is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{N}$ because L is a left Quillen functor. Likewise, $L^{\mathcal{G}}A \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is cofibrant because $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ is a left Quillen functor by Proposition 5.2, so it is also $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{N}$ (Proposition 4.12). Moreover, all the horizontal maps are $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrations by Proposition 4.9. Using once again [Hir03] (15.10.12(1)), to show that the map χ_{A_∞} is a weak equivalence, it is enough to show that all the vertical maps ξ_k in (5.6.3) for $0 \le k < \infty$ are weak equivalences by induction. The map ξ_0 is the $[r]$-entry of the map χ_A, so it is a weak equivalence.

For the induction step, suppose ξ_{k-1} is a weak equivalence. We must show that ξ_k is a weak equivalence, for which we will use a cube argument similar to (4.10.3).

Consider the commutative diagram in $\mathcal{N}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$:



(5.6.4)

The back face is L applied to the pushout square (4.5.3) corresponding to the given pushout square (5.6.1). The front face is the pushout square (4.5.3) corresponding to the pushout square (5.6.2). The objects $Q^k_{k-1}(i)$ and $Q^k_{k-1}(Li)$ refer to the Q-construction (Def. 4.4) for the maps i and Li, respectively. By Proposition 4.9, the left vertical maps in the back and the front faces are $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrations in $\mathcal{N}$, and all the objects are $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant. Thus, by the Cube Lemma [Hov99] (5.2.6), to show that ξ_k is a weak equivalence, it is enough to show that the maps α and β are weak equivalences.

The map α is a coproduct of the following compositions in $\mathcal{N}^{\Sigma_{[r]}}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} L\Big\{A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}(i)\Big\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{(LA)\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}(Li)\Big\} \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_2} \\ & & \Sigma_{[r]}{}_{\mathrm{Aut}(G,\mathsf{ds})} \Big\{B\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}(Li)\Big\} \end{array}$$

The map α_1 is induced by the lax comonoidal structure map of L [SS03] (3.4), while the map α_2 is induced by the map χ_A. Since all three objects are $\Sigma_{[r]}$-cofibrant by Proposition 4.9, to show that α is a weak equivalence, it is enough to show that α_1 and α_2 are weak equivalences.

Since χ_A is a weak equivalence, the same argument as in the paragraph containing (4.10.4) shows that α_2 is a weak equivalence. For α_1, first note that by Proposition 4.9 and the fact that L is a left Quillen functor, the domain and the codomain of the map

$$L\Big\{A\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}(i)\Big\} \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}_1} (LA)\big(\mathsf{n}(G)\big)\otimes Q^k_{k-1}(Li)$$

are $\mathrm{Aut}(G, \mathtt{ds})$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{N}$. Using the left Quillen functor (4.9.2) and Ken Brown's Lemma [Hov99] (1.1.12), to show that α_1 is a weak equivalence, it is enough to show that $\overline{\alpha}_1$ is a weak equivalence. Since (L, R) is a weak monoidal Quillen pair and all the objects in $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are cofibrant, $\overline{\alpha}_1$ is a weak equivalence by [Mur14] (4.3). This finishes the proof that α is a weak equivalence. The proof that β is a weak equivalence is the same as the one above for α but with $Y^{\otimes k}$ and $(LY)^{\otimes k}$ replacing $Q^k_{k-1}(i)$ and $Q^k_{k-1}(Li)$, respectively. This finishes the induction step that ξ_k is a weak equivalence. □

The following key observation is the generalized prop version of [SS03] (5.1(1), for monoids) and [Mur14] (4.2, for 1-colored non-symmetric operads). Note that those two settings are both non-symmetric, while most shrinkable pasting schemes (Proposition 3.3) have graphs that encode symmetric group actions. In particular, the category $\mathcal{N}^S$ (2.13.2), where the map χ_P lives, captures the underlying equivariant structure.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose:*

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ *is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen pair with left adjoint* L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in both* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$.
- *All objects of* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *are cofibrant.*
- P *is a cofibrant* $\mathcal{G}$*-prop in* $\mathcal{M}$.

Then the map $\chi_P : LP \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}P$ *is a weak equivalence in* $\mathcal{N}^S$.

Proof. Exactly as in (4.12.1), P is a retract of the colimit P_∞ of a transfinite composition

$$\varnothing = P_0 \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathsf{colim}_k P_k = P_\infty$$

in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ starting at the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop $P_0 = \varnothing$, where each map $P_{k-1} \longrightarrow P_k$ is a pushout as in (4.5.1) with $i : X \longrightarrow Y$ a generating cofibration in $\mathcal{M}$. By the naturality of $\chi_{(-)}$, it is enough to show that χ_{P_∞} is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{N}^S$.

Applying L and $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ to the transfinite composition, we obtain a commutative ladder diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} LP_0 & \longrightarrow & LP_1 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{colim}_k LP_k \cong LP_\infty \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi_{P_0}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi_{P_1}} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi_{P_\infty}} \\ L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0 & \longrightarrow & L^{\mathcal{G}}P_1 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{colim}_k L^{\mathcal{G}}P_k \cong L^{\mathcal{G}}P_\infty \end{array}$$

in $\mathcal{N}^S$. The initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop P_0 is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}$, and LP_0 is $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant in $\mathcal{N}$. Since $L^{\mathcal{G}}P_0$ is the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop in $\mathcal{N}$, it is likewise $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant. By Propositions 4.9 and the fact that L and $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ are left Quillen functors, all the horizontal maps in the ladder diagram are $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrations. So in particular all the objects are $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$-cofibrant. Using [Hir03] (15.10.12(1)) and the ladder diagram, to show that χ_{P_∞} is

a weak equivalence, it is enough to show by induction that each χ_{P_k} for $k \geq 0$ is a weak equivalence.

Since P_0 is the initial $\mathcal{G}$-prop, the map χ_{P_0} is a weak equivalence by Proposition 5.5. For the induction step, suppose $\chi_{P_{k-1}} : LP_{k-1} \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}P_{k-1}$ is a weak equivalence. We must show that $\chi_{P_k} : LP_k \longrightarrow L^{\mathcal{G}}P_k$ is a weak equivalence. Note that all the P_j's are cofibrant in $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ because P_0 is cofibrant and each map $P_{j-1} \longrightarrow P_j$ is a pushout of a generating cofibration, hence itself a cofibration. Therefore, χ_{P_k} is a weak equivalence by Proposition 5.6. □

The following observation is our main result about derived change-of-base categories. It is the $\mathcal{G}$-prop version of [SS03] (3.12(3), for monoids) and [Mur14] (1.1, for 1-colored non-symmetric operads).

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose:*

- $L : \mathcal{M} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N} : R$ *is a weak symmetric monoidal Quillen equivalence with left adjoint* L.
- $\mathcal{G} = (S, \mathtt{G})$ *is a shrinkable pasting scheme which is admissible in both* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$.
- *All objects of* $\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *are cofibrant.*

Then there is a Quillen equivalence

$$\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}} \underset{R}{\overset{L^{\mathcal{G}}}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$$

with left adjoint $L^{\mathcal{G}}$.

Proof. This is a Quillen adjunction by Proposition 5.2. To show that it is a Quillen equivalence, suppose $\varphi : L^{\mathcal{G}}A \longrightarrow B$ is a map with $A \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ cofibrant and $B \in \mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$ fibrant. We must show that φ is a weak equivalence if and only if its adjoint map $A \longrightarrow RB$ is a weak equivalence. Recall that weak equivalences are defined entrywise in the underlying categories.

Consider the composition

$$LA \xrightarrow{\chi_A} L^{\mathcal{G}}A \xrightarrow{\varphi} B$$

in $\mathcal{N}^S$, where χ_A is the map defined in (5.3.1). Since A is cofibrant, the map χ_A is a weak equivalence by Proposition 5.7. Thus, φ is a weak equivalence if and only if $\varphi\chi_A$ is a weak equivalence in $\mathcal{N}^S$.

The $\mathcal{G}$-prop A is cofibrant in $\mathcal{M}^S$ by Proposition 4.12, and B is fibrant in $\mathcal{N}^S$ because fibrations in $\mathcal{N}^S$ and $\mathsf{Prop}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{N}}$ are both defined entrywise in $\mathcal{N}$. Since (L, R) is a Quillen equivalence, the entrywise prolongations $\mathcal{M}^S \rightleftarrows \mathcal{N}^S$ in (5.2.1) form a Quillen equivalence. So $\varphi\chi_A$ is a weak equivalence if and only if its adjoint $A \longrightarrow RB \in \mathcal{N}^S$ is a weak equivalence, which finishes the proof. □

REFERENCES

[BB14] M. A. Batanin and C. Berger, Homotopy theory for algebras over polynomial monads, preprint, arXiv:1305.0086. 1

[BM06] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk, The Boardman-Vogt resolution of operads in monoidal model categories, Topology 45 (2006), 807–849. 15, 19

[BM07] C. Berger and I. Moerdijk, Resolution of coloured operads and rectification of homotopy algebras, Contemp. Math. 431 (2007), 31–58. 1, 8, 9

[Bor94] F. Borceux, Handbook of categorical algebra 2, categories and structures, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK. 23

[DK] W. G. Dwyer and D. M. Kan. Simplicial localizations of categories. J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 17(3):267–284, 1980. 1

[EM06] A.D. Elmendorf and M.A. Mandell, Rings, modules, and algebras in infinite loop space theory, Advances in Math. 205(1), 163-228, 2006. 15

[Fre10] B. Fresse, Props in model categories and homotopy invariance of structures, Georgian Math. J. 17 (2010), 79–160. 1, 9

[Gan04] Wee Liang Gan, Koszul duality for dioperads, Math. Res. Lett. 10 (2003), 109-124. 2

[HR] P. Hackney and M. Robertson, The homotopy theory of simplicial props, preprint, arXiv:1209.1087. 6

[HRY14] P. Hackney, M. Robertson, D. Yau, Relative left properness of colored operads, preprint, arXiv:1411.4668. 2, 9

[Har10] J.E. Harper, Homotopy theory of modules over operads and non-Σ operads in monoidal model categories, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214 (2010), 1407–1434. 15

[Hir03] P.S. Hirschhorn, Model categories and their localizations, Math. Surveys and Monographs 99, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 2003. 3, 8, 9, 17, 19, 20, 23, 26, 28

[Hov99] M. Hovey, Model categories, Math. Surveys and Monographs 63, Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1999. 20, 21, 27, 28

[JY09] M.W. Johnson and D. Yau, On homotopy invariance for algebras over colored PROPs, J. Homotopy and Related Structures 4 (2009), 275–315. 1

[Lur09] J. Lurie, Higher Topos Theory, Annals of Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009. 12

[Mac98] S. Mac Lane, Categories for the working mathematician, Grad. Texts in Math. 5, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. 3

[MMS09] M. Markl, S. Merkulov, and S. Shadrin, Wheeled PROPs, graph complexes and the master equation, J. Pure Appl. Alg. 213 (2009), 496-535. 2

[Mer10b] S.A. Merkulov, Wheeled props in algebra, geometry and quantization, European Congress of Math., p. 83-114, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2010. 2

[Mur11] F. Muro, Homotopy theory of nonsymmetric operads, Alg. Geom. Top. 11 (2011) 1541–1599. 1, 12

[Mur14] F. Muro, Homotopy theory of non-symmetric operads, II: Change of base category and left properness, Alg. Geom. Top. 14 (2014) 229–281; corrections, arXiv:1507.06644. 2, 28, 29

[Qui69] D. Quillen, Rational homotopy theory, Ann. of Math. (2) 90 (1969) 205–295. 23

[Rez02] Charles Rezk, Every homotopy theory of simplicial algebras admits a proper model, Topology Appl. 119 (2002), no. 1, 65–94. 2

[Rez96] C.W. Rezk, Spaces of algebra structures and cohomology of operads, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 1996. 8

[SS00] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, Algebras and modules in monoidal model categories, Proc. London Math. Soc. 80 (2000), 491–511. 12

[SS03] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, Equivalences of monoidal model categories, Alg. Geom. Top. 3 (2003), 287–334. 2, 3, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29

[WY15] D. White and D. Yau, Bousfield localization and algebras over colored operads, arXiv:1503.06720. 8

[Yau16] D. Yau, Colored Operads, to appear in Graduate Studies in Math., Amer. Math. Soc. 8
[YJ15] D. Yau and M.W. Johnson, A Foundation for PROPs, Algebras, and Modules, Math. Surveys and Monographs 203, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2015 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 23, 24

MATEMATISKA INSTITUTIONEN, STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET, 106 91 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

E-mail address: hackney@math.su.se

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE, VICTORIA 3010, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: marcy.robertson@unimelb.edu.au

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY AT NEWARK, NEWARK, OH

E-mail address: dyau@math.osu.edu